

Town Meeting



Reg. U.S. Pat. Off.

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



Reg. U.S. Pat. Off.

What Next in Europe Now?

Moderator, **GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.**

Speakers

H. V. KALTENBORN

HAROLD J. LASKI

LOUIS P. LOCHNER

MAX LERNER

(See also page 13)

COMING

—April 27, 1948—

**Will the Third Party Bring Us Peace
and Prosperity?**

Published by **THE TOWN HALL, Inc.**, New York 18, N. Y.

VOLUME 13, NUMBER 52



\$4.50 A YEAR: 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF APRIL 20:

"What Next in Europe Now?"

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Mr. DENNY | 3 |
| Mr. KALTENBORN | 3 |
| Mr. LASKI | 6 |
| Mr. LOCHNER | 8 |
| Mr. LERNER | 10 |
| THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN | 13 |
| QUESTIONS, PLEASE! | 15 |



THE BROADCAST OF APRIL 27:

"Will the Third Party Bring Us Peace and Prosperity?"



The Broadcast of April 20, 1948, originated at the University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EST., over the American Broadcasting Company Network.



Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



APRIL 20, 1948

VOL. 13, No. 52

What Next in Europe Now?

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. Today the ears of the world have been tuned to Italy to hear the results of the Italian elections last Sunday and Monday. All day long the American people have been listening for news and now they want to know the full meaning of the facts. Anticipating this, your Town Meeting arranged this program with four outstanding authorities on world affairs to give us their views on this very important question, "What Next in Europe Now?"

Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn, dean of American radio commentators is standing by in New York to give us the very latest results and his comments.

Here in Columbia, South Carolina, in the spacious Field House of the University of South Carolina are Dr. Harold Laski, member of the National Executive Committee of the British Labor Party who is in this country as the guest of Roosevelt College of Chicago;

Louis P. Lochner, for 15 years chief of the Berlin Bureau of the Associated Press and political adviser to Mr. Herbert Hoover on his recent economic survey of Europe; and Max Lerner, author and editor—all three of whom will give us their opinions, and it's not unlikely that the opinions of these speakers will conflict decidedly.

Let's hear first from the dean himself who's made frequent trips to Europe and who last summer with Mrs. Kaltenborn took a 42-day trip around the world, visiting all the world capitals and talking to all the world leaders. Mr. Kaltenborn speaking to us from New York. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Kaltenborn:

Good evening, everybody. The latest returns from Italy continue to emphasize the Communist defeat. Premier De Gasperi's Christian Democrats have now won enough seats in both Senate and Chamber to control both houses. Vice Premier Saragat announced

tonight there would be no Communists in Italy's next Cabinet. Anti-Communists now have 70 per cent of the total vote.

One other bulletin: The Soviet Union threatened tonight to end all Russian-American collaboration in Vienna. American soldiers released a woman illegally arrested by Russian officers in the American zone. The Russian protest calls this provocative action.

The defeat of communism in Italy's free election looks like a turning point in postwar Europe. The high tide of Communist power may have passed. That high tide was reached with communism's conquest of Czechoslovakia. The Communist defeat in Italy marks a major set back.

The Reds took over Czechoslovakia by the threat of force. Democracy conquered Italy by constructive co-operative action. The Marshall Plan has scored an important first success. Max Lerner may call it intervention. I call it generous co-operation to help what is left of free Europe to remain free.

I wish we could believe that promises are always more persuasive than threats. The Russian threat hangs over Europe as a dark menacing cloud. Our economic help is important, but it is not enough. We must also give reality to our promise of military help against Soviet aggression.

Harold Laski may tell you that some people exaggerate the Rus-

sian danger so let's not be hysterical but factual. General Bradley has just told the world that Russia has 170 divisions on call. We have 18.

The Italian has Tito's communist divisions on his frontier. Our troops, except for a few units on occupation duty, are 4,000 miles from Europe. Nor have we offered any specific guarantee or promise that we will use our troops to defend Italy against invasion. This should help us understand why so many millions of Italians voted Communist.

The Italians have seen Russia win one victory after another in the cold war for the conquest of Europe. When the Gallup Poll asked Italians whether we or Russia were winning the cold war, most Italians said Russia. That was a few weeks ago. The arrival of American help and our firmer policy towards Russia have evidently persuaded some Italians to change their minds.

The Marshall Plan has now begun to provide Europe with economic help on a large scale. It has promoted co-operation and alliance among the democratic states.

The first concrete steps toward European unity have been taken. We are no longer permitting communism to take over Europe by default. But here in the United States we are still far from agreement on the exact conditions under which we will provide Europe with military help against military ag-

gression. Yet the President of the United States has definitely promised the free nations of Europe that we would help them against attack. He said we would do it by appropriate means.

At this moment Congress is deciding what the appropriate means should be. With the limited defense budget, it is no easy task to determine the power balance among land, sea, and air forces. This is certain, we must have some land forces in reserve so unless we restore the draft and also adopt the military training program we encourage the Kremlin to believe that we don't mean what we say.

We are the only strong power in the world that does not have conscription. Yet because of our commitments all over the world, we need a larger army than the volunteer system can provide. We should either take our soldiers out of Austria, Germany, and Italy, or prepare to back them up with land power as well as with sea power and air power. The more we mobilize our power, the less chance there is that we'll have to use it.

If Soviet Russia continues the present squeeze against us in Berlin and Vienna, war is possible. When General Clay told the Russians we propose to remain in Berlin, he spoke for the American Government. But it's up to us at home to prove to the cold-blooded Kremlin dictators that we are ready and willing to back him up.

We have shown that we are willing to invest billions of dollars to promote recovery and peace, but would America again be willing to send men overseas to fight for democracy? All Europe is asking that question. They ask it at the Council Table in the Kremlin before deciding on the next step in the cold war.

Let us remember this, every American soldier now in Europe is risking his life and his freedom, for if Russia decides to strike, it will be secretly and suddenly with overwhelming land power. There will be no time to evacuate our forces from Berlin, Vienna, or Trieste in the face of the communist advance.

We owe it to the men now in uniform and to those who may have to don the uniform to be ready for war as we are ready for peace.

I do not despair of peace. The situation is critical only so long as the hard-headed realists who make Soviet policy want it to be critical. So far, we have let them win on almost every front. During the war, their unscrupulous diplomacy defeated us at Teheran, at Yalta, and at Potsdam.

In Europe, we let them take the Baltic states, Poland, the Balkans, Hungary, the large part of Austrian Germany, and Czechoslovakia. Our unhappy efforts at appeasement increased Soviet power, expanded Soviet prestige, and stimulated Soviet ambitions.

Finally, a year ago, we substituted firmness for weakness by resolute action. We checked the Communist advance in Iran, in Greece, in Turkey, and now in Italy, yet some misguided souls think that a friendly chat with Stalin could settle everything. They want another Munich where Chamberlain's "peace in our time" turned out to be war in Hitler's time.

Louis Lochner will tell you how hard we have tried to be good friends with Russia. The decisive struggle still lies ahead. It is now centered in Berlin and Vienna.

We can win it with peace if we convince Russia's realists that we are ready to win it with war. Above all, no more appeasement. Concessions? Yes, of course, but on a 50-50 basis.

What comes next in Europe depends on what comes next in America. Today, only the voice of power is the voice of persuasion. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn. Incidentally, I forgot to tell you that Mr. Kaltenborn is also breaking into the movies, taking the part of himself in the new motion picture to be called, "The Babe Ruth Story." Indeed, Mr. Kaltenborn's just come back from the kleig lights of Hollywood.

Our next speaker is noted the world around as an author, orator, economist, and a center of con-

troversy. He's one of the most vigorous and provocative members of the British Labor Party, serves on its National Committee, and is author of a tract exposing the activities of the Communist Party in Great Britain called *The Secret Battalion*.

He was brought to America this time by Roosevelt College in Chicago to give a series of lectures there, and we are indebted to Roosevelt College for having him with us tonight. We are happy to welcome back to Town Meeting, Mr. Harold J. Laski, of London. Mr. Laski. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Laski:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. Power is not, as Mr. Kaltenborn thinks, the parent of persuasion. Power is the parent of fear.

By all means make the power of the United States proportionate to your commitments but make no commitments which invite either your militarists or the forces of big business, in concert with them, to shape their character.

European aid from America is a magnanimous gesture. Your problem and our problem is to make it a great idea. Don't let it degenerate into the mistaken belief that your economic power can buy Europe or that your economic power can bribe Europe into following any lead European aid may demand from it.

Italians voted for freedom, Mr. Chairman, because they were de-

siours of ending the fear of totalitarianism in Italy, because as Italians, they belong to the European tradition of freedom. They will not go on voting for freedom if they are to become a pawn on a wider chessboard where you move the pieces on your side.

The defeat there of the Communists is an opportunity for strengthening democratic foundations in Europe, but it is not more, yet. It must be used as an opportunity to the full, and it is Italians who must be helped to use it in the Italian way and not in the American way.

There are the faint beginnings of revival in Europe. The Western union can do much, and as long as it becomes no more than a military alliance, it will fail. It is by becoming more that it may be the beginning of genuine recovery so long as it is not regarded as a closed association.

Europe is one and indivisible. Part of that Europe is a united German people, necessarily supervised until its democracy is genuine, but not less necessarily a unified people.

Mr. Kaltenborn's power will not persuade to discussion and discussion is the road to peace. If there is hysteria in America about Russia, if you go witch-hunting you will find witches. If you talk war, you make war-mindedness. Both of them frustrate the Europe in which rational negotiation is possible.

Mr. Chairman, I talked at length with the men in the Kremlin. I do not believe they want war, and I say that knowing the ugliness of their regime; I say that knowing the monstrous blunders that they have committed.

The charge of imperialist expansion against them is as ludicrous as the power of imperialist expansion urged against you. They want security. They're afraid that American power will destroy their security. They find grounds for that fear in the aid you give to indefensible governments like that of China and Greece and Turkey—none of them governments, Mr. Chairman, in the American tradition of democratic freedom.

Much of Russian pride is responsible for their folly. There were times when you were proud, too, when you were a young Nation, at the beginning of your destiny. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, let us keep on guard, or let us make experiment with friendship.

What history will remember is the nation with imagination to take the first great step to peace. I should like to see my own Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee, go to Moscow—invitation or no invitation—to tell the whole world that he has gone there to prepare the agenda of peace.

I want to see the forces of peace mobilized and under leadership, to overcome fear and suspicion, so that we have the quality of leadership in crisis given by Franklin

Roosevelt and by Winston Churchill.

Once more, we have nothing to fear but fear itself. Let us have the courage to conquer fear. The defeat of fear, Mr. Chairman, is the first great stride towards a creative and a lasting peace. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Laski. Our next speaker is one of the outstanding authorities on Germany and Central Europe, having served for 15 years as Chief of the Berlin Bureau of the Associated Press, and most recently as adviser to ex-President Hoover on his economic survey of Europe. He is a Pulitzer prize winner, and author of a book to be published tomorrow, called *Goebbels's Diaries*. We are happy to welcome back to Town Meeting Mr. Louis P. Lochner. Mr. Lochner. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Lochner:

Mr. Chairman. Mr. Laski's proposal for a new conference between Prime Minister Attlee and Stalin is an alluring one. But I ask Mr. Laskie, why must all trips be made in an eastern direction? Is it not just about time that Uncle Joe came west? It might do him some good. (*Laughter and applause.*)

But waiving that point, I fear Mr. Laski thinks of discussion in terms of democratic practices, namely, discussion in a give and

take spirit, from which results mutual compromises.

Possibly because I lived for nine years in Berlin under a nazi totalitarianism very much like the communist, I am especially allergic to so-called conferences. I cannot help but notice that totalitarian regimes must forever "save face" and be uncompromising, so that, in effect, you can have a conference with a totalitarian representative, and achieve a tangible result only if you do it on *his* terms.

I witnessed the sad spectacle of appeasement at Munich in September, '38, by which Czechoslovakia was sold down the river and Premier Neville Chamberlain's pathetic "Peace in our Times" became a ghastly joke; also how those two dramatically imaginative statesmen, whom Mr. Laskie extols, F. D. R. and Mr. Winston Churchill, made one of the rottenest deals in history at the Yalta conference. (*Applause.*) So much by way of warning about conferences.

The Italian elections, I believe were but a skirmish in the battle of two Titans, democracy and communism. The struggle will continue unabated. This continued clash need not lead to war, provided we make the world's greatest single effort at reconstruction ever undertaken, the ERP, an outstanding success.

Now, specifically, here are some of the things to be done next in Europe now.

1. Let us keep hammering away at the peoples of Europe through every instrumentality for the dissemination of information that we possess that:

(a) The Iron Curtain is not a democratic but a totalitarian invention.

(b) We would far rather have all Europe benefit from the ERP than only the 17 countries now included.

(c) The unhappy virtual division of Germany into two parts was accepted by the Western powers only after an infinitely patient but vain effort by the United States and Great Britain to achieve the German economic unification promised at Potsdam.

(d) The Western powers went to almost abject lengths at Yalta and Potsdam to enlist Russian cooperation and allay Russian fears.

(e) These conferences were preceded by unparalleled American cooperativeness in supplying the Soviets with equipment needed for their pursuit of the common war on Hitler.

The exploitation of these truths is probably distasteful to Americans who are averse to propaganda. Unfortunately, we have had to learn the hard way that Hitler and Stalin were right in their technique of constant repetition of certain basic ideas.

2. Let us give every encouragement to those far-sighted Europeans who see an unprecedented

opportunity now for practically establishing a United States of Western Europe as a forerunner to a United States of all Europe. Associated in a common effort, the Western European nations could live as peacefully side by side as the United States and Canada do today. Such encouragement on our part would be further evidence that the U.S.A. has no aggressive designs on other peoples.

3. The central aim of ERP is that of enabling the countries benefited to get back on their own feet as quickly as possible. We shall do free Europe a poor service if we let it become a permanent beggar at the door of Uncle Sam, or if we try to make an economic colony of Europe.

4. The 17th country included in the ERP is Western Germany. Before that bloc of states can do its proper constructive share, the desperately-needed 600,000 workers, who are still prisoners of war in France and England, must be released at last.

5. The one and one-third million displaced persons who still lead a tragic life in camps in Austria, Germany, and Italy must be permitted to go to countries which can absorb them, and not remain a festering wound in the center of Europe.

6. For the good of all Western Europe, the uneconomical policy of dismantling nonmilitary plants and installations in Germany must be discontinued and all of that

country's peaceful resources made available for production. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Lochner. Our next speaker is also a journalist, author, and educator. He was, for a time, professor of political science at Williams College and has just completed work on a book to be published next fall called *Actions and Passions*. Mr. Max Lerner, also a familiar voice to Town Meeting listeners. Mr. Lerner. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Lerner:

Mr. Denny, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Lochner has said so many admirable things in his specific plan, I'm sorry he said what he did about Mr. Laski's suggestion for talks between the East and the West. Mr. Lochner raises the doubt as to whether a totalitarian government can negotiate. Surely, at this juncture this is to prejudge Russia before the event. Let us at least put to her the test of negotiation before we throw up our hands at the futility of a peace by agreement.

Mr. Lochner, who is the greatest living authority today on Josef Goebbels and who knows the workings of the Nazi propaganda mind, must know that this stark confronting of the democratic and communist worlds like two armed camps is exactly what Goebbels and Hitler prayed for, and what

they tried so desperately to achieve.

I think Mr. Laski digs deeper to the roots of the crisis when he fixes on the problem of fear, because there are two economies which face each other like armed camps, and the ruling groups are terrified of each other. In the light of this analysis, I find it very hard to go along with Mr. Kaltenborn's sustained emphasis on the policy of force—land power, he says, sea power, air power. Today, he says, only the voice of power is the voice of persuasion.

I wonder whether he is wholly right in his emphasis. Obviously, we've got to have military strength behind our program, but let us not make the mistake of substituting military strength for our program. When two frightened men confront each other, the act of pulling a gun may be disastrous even if you pull a gun only to show your opponent that you have it.

America doesn't have to worry about power, Mr. Chairman, we have plenty of it. We have the newest models of the atom bomb, for example, a little gadget whose latest variety we have recently tested on a Pacific atoll. We have a Navy that covers the seven seas; we have an air force that darkens the skies.

Our big problem is to fight another struggle before the struggle of military power—a struggle to prevent the struggle of military

power. I'm talking about the struggle for the hearts and the souls of men, one which will make the democratic idea persuasive.

No, Mr. Kaltenborn, the voice of power is not the voice of persuasion. I should say that for Americans the voice of persuasion is the voice of power.

Whatever the outcome of elections in Europe, I think that we ought to do our worrying about some crucial things. I don't mean that the fate of Europe isn't important; it is. Europe will decide its fate well if Europeans are not hungry.

Whatever we do to affect that fate, let's make certain that we don't betray the principles on which our national life is based. I mean the principles of integrity. I mean the principles of real non-intervention — real nonintervention.

I believe in the old-fashioned view that Americans ought to live up to their professions, that they ought to live up to what they say when they say that they want the nations of the world to make up their own minds.

Our task is a simple one—to see that the free peoples of the world have a chance to make free political and moral choices. Just as soon as we start coercing them, we are playing the antidemocratic game and not the democratic game.

I support the ERP for the democratic countries of Europe, but to me the crucial point about ERP

is not only that it is a way of beating the communists. That will, I hope and pray, come as one of the end products. But it would be fatal if that were our immediate and our sole motive, for it's a deadly doctrine of negativism, and America was not built on negativism.

Our aim in foreign policy should be positive. It should be to help people live; to rebuild their shattered economies. That's important, because if your concern is only to stop communism you will accept any ally, even a fascist one. That's what we are doing in many cases, and you will become so obsessed that it will lead you to totalitarianism.

No, I say that the job of the United States is to devote itself to what it's best equipped for—to raise living standards, to bring out in democracy — and I'm talking about our own democracy; I'm talking about economic democracy; I'm talking about a democracy that knows no bounds of color and creed—to bring out in our democracy those vital and attractive and exciting traits that it does possess, which make it not only something that we are ready to die for, but something that the decent peoples all over the world will be ready to live by. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Max Lerner. Now, gentlemen, will you join me up here around the microphone and,

figurately, Mr. Kaltenborn, will you chip in with us and start the discussion period? Mr. Kaltenborn?

Mr. Kaltenborn: Well, I'd like to say just a word or two about the things that Mr. Laski and that Mr. Lerner said. Obviously, we are in more complete agreement than many people might have supposed before the discussion began.

I'd like to ask Mr. Laski, for example, what he means when he says that we should help in the Italian way and not in the American way. It seems to me that on the basis of these election returns the Italians have been going the American way. I see no reason why the two ways should be mutually exclusive.

There's one statement he made that I would challenge. He said Russia's imperialist expansion is as ludicrous as when urged against us. Well, the Russians have annexed a hundred million people and a million square miles since the close of the war and certainly that is not ludicrous when you make that statement. Where has the United States done anything of that kind? I rather object to that kind of a comparison.

As for Mr. Lerner, I think he was extremely persuasive and with most of what he said I would agree. But, he says we prejudice Russia before the event because we're not going to talk to Russia now, right away.

What have we done but talked

for the last three years? We've tried every possible means to get along with Russia. Again and again our overtures were rejected, and when an agreement was made, it was violated.

He objects to my sustained emphasis on power. He says we must have power, yes, but not too much. But what does he say? He talks about our atom bombs, our Navy on the Seven Seas, an Air Force that darkens the skies. Well, that puts more emphasis on power than I gave.

No, it's true we should, as he says, see that people have three choices. Well, that's what we're trying to do. That's what we have done, and because of Russia's attitude, there is no free choice for any people under Russian rule.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn. Now, let's have a comment from Mr. Laski.

Mr. Laski: Mr. Kaltenborn says in effect to you that you've tried out Russia and found it wanting. He says that you've done everything that could be done to European peoples to live your way of life, and that he's put at their disposal enough power to compel all of them to live your way of life.

I note behind the accents of the dean of broadcasters persuasiveness—I don't like deans; I'm an academic person and I don't believe in administrators in a university—I think that what Mr. Kaltenborn really means is that,

as a skillful propagandist, what he is in effect attempting to do is the simple and straightforward work that is done every Saturday night

in the name of a great male cosmetic by that historic figure in the history of the American Navy, Commander Winchell. (*Laughter.*)

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

HAROLD J. LASKI—In America for a series of lectures under the auspices of Roosevelt College in Chicago, Mr. Laski is a member of the National Executive Committee of the Labor Party of Great Britain. Born in Manchester in 1893, he was educated at Manchester Grammar School and at New College of Oxford. He has been a professor of political science at the University of London since 1926.

Mr. Laski has taught in America at McGill University, Harvard, Yale, and Amherst, and has been a lecturer at Trinity College in Dublin and at Magdalene College, Cambridge.

From 1921 to 1930, Mr. Laski was vice chairman of the British Institute of Adult Education. He was a member of the Fabian Society Executive from 1922 to 1936, and has been a member of the Industrial Court since 1926.

Mr. Laski is the author of many books including *Democracy in a Crisis* and *The American Democracy*, and has had articles published in both British and American magazines.

HANS V. KALTENBORN — Dean of radio commentators, H. V. Kaltenborn made his first news broadcast in 1922. Born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Mr. Kaltenborn was graduated from Harvard in 1909 with an A.B. cum laude. Since then, he has received several honorary degrees. For twenty years, 1910-1930, he was associated with the *Brooklyn Eagle*. In 1930, he left the *Eagle* for WABC, key station for the Columbia network. Since 1940, he has been with the National Broadcasting Company. Mr. Kaltenborn has been radio reporter for many political conventions, League of Nations sessions, Pan American Peace Conferences, and the like. His honors and citations for meritorious radio reporting are too numerous to mention. He was awarded a gold plaque for the best foreign radio reporting covering the Spanish front in 1936, when he made possible the first radio transmission of artillery and machine-gun fire during actual combat. Mr. Kaltenborn is the author of several books and many magazine articles. Among his books are *We Look at the World*, *Kaltenborn Edits the News* and *I Broadcast the Crisis*. Mr. Kaltenborn, who has traveled widely, has a knowledge of several

foreign languages including French, German, and Italian. He returned recently from a trip around the world.

MAX LERNER—An author and educator, Max Lerner is chief editorial writer for *PM*. Born in Minsk, Russia, in 1902, he was brought to this country when he was five years old. He received an A.B. from Yale in 1923 and then continued to study law there for a year. In 1925, he received his A.M. from Washington University in St. Louis, and in 1927, his Ph.D. from Brookings Graduate School of Economics and Government in Washington.

Mr. Lerner served as assistant editor and later as managing editor of the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. From 1932 to 1936, he was a member of the faculty of Sarah Lawrence College. He has been on the faculty of the Summer Institute at Wellesley, a lecturer in government at Harvard, and from 1938 until 1943 was professor of political science at Williams College. For two years he was editor of *The Nation*.

The author of several books including *The Mind and Faith of Justice Holmes*, Mr. Lerner's next book, *Actions and Passions*, will be published next fall.

LOUIS PAUL LOCHNER—Born in Springfield, Illinois, in 1887, Mr. Lochner is a graduate of the Wisconsin Conservatory of Music and has an A.B. degree from the University of Wisconsin where he was editor of several college publications.

In 1915-16, Mr. Lochner was secretary to Henry Ford on the Ford Peace Mission to Europe. He served as secretary for the Neutral Conference for Continuous Mediation at Stockholm and at The Hague, and as editor of the International Labor News Service.

A newspaper correspondent since 1919, Mr. Lochner was chief of the Berlin Bureau of the Associated Press from 1928 to 1942. He was also a radio commentator and news analyst for Press Association, Inc., and the National Broadcasting Co. In 1939 he was a Pulitzer prize winner for his work as a foreign correspondent.

In 1947, Mr. Lochner was a member of the Hoover Mission to Germany. He is the author of several books, the latest of which, *Goebbels' Diaries*, is the Book of the Month selection for May, 1948.

Mr. Denny: Except, Mr. Laskie, you missed the night of the week. It's Sunday night. All right. Mr. Kaltenborn, any further comments?

Mr. Kaltenborn: I would just like to offer the comment that I consider it a very unhappy comparison. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. Mr. Lochner?

Mr. Lochner: I think it is all very well for Mr. Lerner to state that to stop communism is a negative thing. I like positive things much more than negative, but we often speak of the onward march of communism in Europe, either as an inundation, a flood, or a conflagration, a fire.

Now in case of a fire in the neighborhood, however much you may think that hereafter I'm going to make my own house fireproof and put all sorts of gadgets in there, while the fire is on, the most positive thing you can do is the negative one of stopping that fire. Then only can you begin to renovate your own house and put it in order.

I want to see all those beautiful things done in our country, that Mr. Lerner wants us to do, but I think that there is an immediate task and that is the task of stopping something that is preventing us all from breathing easier and trying to put our own houses in order. That is to stop Communism. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now Mr. Lerner.

Mr. Lerner: I'd like to say to both Mr. Lochner and to Mr. Kaltenborn that our differences are the differences of emphasis but emphasis is terribly important. Mr. Kaltenborn says that I, too, talk about an American Army and Navy and atom bomb. I talked about them but in such a way as to give us reassurance that we don't have to become hysterical on that score; that we ought to give our attention to other matters.

Mr. Lochner gives us the analogy of an inundation or of a fire. I think those are treacherous analogies because they miss the basic point, and that is that the struggle between us and Russia is basically a struggle that goes on in the minds and hearts of men, and that struggle is not going to be solved in any way by military force.

Military force represents the outer framework, but within that outer framework, we still have our whole job to do. I say again that you cannot do that job by the latest models of atom bombs; that you can't do it by increasing air forces, and that you cannot do it possibly by telling the Italian people, "If you don't vote our way we will withdraw food from you." Regardless of the way the Italian elections went, that is a disastrous mode of procedure in the long run. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Lerner. Now, we'll hear from you

gentlemen again in just a moment. Now, while we get ready for our question period, I'm sure that you, our listeners, will be interested in the following message.

Announcer: You are listening to America's Town Meeting of the Air originating in Columbia, South Carolina, where we are discussing the question, "What Next in Europe Now?" You have just heard H. V. Kaltenborn, Harold J. Laski, Louis Lochner and Max Lerner. We are about to take questions from the audience.

If you would like a copy of tonight's broadcast, complete with the questions and answers to follow, send for the Town Meeting Bulletin, enclosing ten cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing. If you would like to subscribe to the Bulletin for six months, send \$2.35; or for a year, send \$4.50. Just address Town Hall, New York 18, New York, and allow at least two weeks for delivery.

Perhaps you have already been

approached, indeed, perhaps you have already made a contribution to the American Cancer Society's drive for funds. But still, this deadly disease continues to strike down our friends and members of our families from ambush.

A recent Gallup Poll has shown that more Americans fear cancer than any other disease. When you realize that every three minutes someone dies of cancer, you can see why this fear is so widespread. But we can and will stop this killer if we get together and attack it on every front.

The American Cancer Society through its three-fold program of education, service and research is putting up a relentless fight to conquer cancer once and for all—but they need our support—yours and mine, to carry on their vital work. So let's all give generously to the American Cancer Society's drive for funds. Give more than before!

Now for our question period, we return you to Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Here we are in the Field House of the University of South Carolina in Columbia with a great group of people ready to ask questions. Our attendants are in the aisles with portable microphones and members of the audience are holding up number cards indicating the speaker to whom

their question is directed. The first question, I believe, is for Mr. Laski. Is that right?

Man: Yes, sir. I wish to ask Mr. Laski what assistance, if any, including military aid, should be given to an elected democratic government in Italy in the event of a communist uprising there?

Mr. Laski: I think that the best aid that you can give to a genuinely elected democratic government in Italy in the event of a communist uprising is, in the first place, to allow the Italian government to deal with it. If an Italian uprising is suppressed by an Italian government, the whole of Europe will understand, but if an Italian uprising is suppressed by an American government, the World War III is on. When the World War III is on, none of us will be left to discuss its aftermath in Europe. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. A question for Mr. Lochner?

Man: Mr. Lochner. Do you believe that Franco Spain should be included in a Western nation bloc against Soviet Russia? If so, why so? If not, why not?

Mr. Lochner: Decidedly, no! The American Republic cannot afford anywhere to stand there as the sponsor of fascism.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Lerner has a comment on that.

Mr. Lerner: I think Mr. Lochner's answer does him honor, and I agree with him completely, but I'd like to point out that the House of Representatives did not agree with him or with me.

I'd like to point out also that the American House of Representatives followed the logic of what has been said to it so persistently by the military people in this country. They really went so far with that logic that they went

much farther than the diplomatic groups and the State Department wanted them to go. I think that that episode was a very interesting commentary on the extent to which we are convincing our own Congressmen that nothing should stop us at all in the attack on Russia. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Laski has a comment.

Mr. Laski: I don't comment on the Congress of the United States while I'm a guest in this country, but I point out, Mr. Chairman that you are committed to the policy of the United Nations which excludes Spain from membership because of the character of its government.

If you want to break the United Nations in its birth, then give aid to Spain. If you want to nourish into living reality the United Nations, stand by the pledges that you have made. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. So that we might have comments from all four speakers, Mr. Kaltenborn, would you care to comment on that?

Mr. Kaltenborn: Yes, I would like to point out that the House of Representatives is not entrusted with the conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States and there was certainly no reaction from the State Department to the House action. The House sometimes acts on impulse and makes mistakes. That does not commit

the Government or the foreign policy of the United States.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Lerner?

Mr. Lerner: Just a factual matter in answer to what Mr. Kaltenborn has said. There was no reaction from the State Department to what the House did. No, not officially, but the crack reporter of the entire reporters corps in Washington, Mr. James Reston, of the *New York Times*, reported immediately after the House action that the people in the State Department were terribly worried about what would be concluded from the action of the House. I think that Mr. Reston was reading the State Department pretty authoritatively and everyone else in Washington thinks so, too.

Mr. Kaltenborn: Well, the fact they were worried does not mean that they endorsed what the House did.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn. Say, Mr. Kaltenborn, you should really be down here tonight. We see why the Southern girls have their reputation for beauty. Here are four beauties right here ready in this line to ask questions. We are going to start with this beautiful brunette in the black dress.

Lady: Mr. Kaltenborn. Who decides our foreign policy in Europe—our military leaders there or the State Department?

Mr. Kaltenborn: In the countries that our Army occupies, the

military commanders discharge the immediate policy, but they are carrying out directives which they have received from the Executive Government of the United States, the President, the Department of State, and the War Department.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Another question for Mr. Lochner. Hold your head up, please, so we can hear you. Thank you.

Man: Mr. Lochner. What chances are there for a communist coup in Italy by force?

Mr. Lochner: I thought I had been billed tonight as somewhat of an expert on Germany. I never like to go into deep water on something I don't know anything about.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Kaltenborn, would you care to tackle that question?

Mr. Kaltenborn: I doubt that there is much of an opportunity for the Communists to accomplish anything by force. They have threatened to hold demonstrations on Sunday in violation of government orders, but the government has mobilized its police and army, and I am convinced that they will be able to handle any attempts to create disorder. There may be some riots. There may be some disorders, but I am convinced that they will not reach the point of revolution.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Laski has a comment.

Mr. Laski: Mr. Chairman, I am not in the business of the prophets.

I'm an analyst and not a prophet. But I don't think that the Communists of Italy would be so foolish as to embark upon an adventure that would destroy communism in the whole of Southeastern Europe. Their leadership may be in a direction that we dislike but it is a skillful and well-organized leadership.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now the lady with the red sash around her hair—excuse me, headband. I beg your pardon. All right.

Lady: Mr. Lerner, why was Italy allowed to go free of any reparations or denazification whatsoever while Germany will bear the brunt of all reparations for many years to come?

Mr. Lerner: I'm not an expert on just why things that were done at the various conferences were done. That would be a matter of reading minds. But from the very start, the struggle to win over the Italian people to one side or the other began, and I think that from the very start neither the Russians nor we wanted to be responsible for setting in motion, with respect to the Italian people, the kind of measures that were set in motion in Germany.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Laski?

Mr. Laski: No people is good enough to educate another people. No people is good enough to attempt to govern another people. You ought to know in the South, and if you haven't learned that in

the South, what has been the use of the last 90 years of American history. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Laski, you-all made a hit. (*Laughter.*) Mr. Lochner.

Mr. Lochner: I really want to call attention to the interesting historical fact that all the belligerents had to sign unconditional surrender but that in each case the application was a different one.

In the case of Japan, we left the Tenno as a connecting link with the past with the result that I think progress has been faster there than it has been in Germany.

In the case of Italy, we indicated that if she would change sides, she would even be called a co-belligerent. That explains why there are no reparations.

In the case of Austria, we said, "You will become a liberated country." Only in the case of Germany did we apply it in the literal sense that we broke up everything and said "under conditional surrender we take away your complete sovereignty." Only the future will show which has been the wiser course, but I see all sorts of danger signals in Germany from the fact that we made a different application there than we did, for instance, in the case of Italy.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now the gentleman down here in the front.

Man: I would like to ask a question of Mr. Kaltenborn. What

move by Russia, short of actual attack, should the United States interpret as an act of aggression which must be met by war?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Kaltenborn?

Mr. Kaltenborn: It is impossible to answer that because Russia could do so many things that we could resent, that we could react against, that we could retaliate for, without war developing. I am convinced that if we continue to show in Berlin and Vienna that we mean what we say, that we propose to stay in both capitals, that the Russians will not provoke us to the point of war.

Mr. Laski: Would Mr. Kaltenborn explain to the questioner how you show Russia "that you mean what you say"? (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Kaltenborn: Yes. In the first place, by passing, here at home, a bill for Selective Service. In the second place, by passing a bill for military service. In the third place, by continuing to maintain the vigorous reaction to every Russian aggressive move that General Clay and the American Commander in Vienna have made so far. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Lerner has a comment.

Mr. Lerner: I would like to point out that the course of action which Mr. Kaltenborn advocates as a general course of action has been followed ever since the time when Mr. Byrnes at the instigation of a man whom you cheer—Mr. Winston Churchill—started the

"get-tough policy" with Russia. To me, it's very interesting that during that entire period, if one may judge from the comments of people like Mr. Kaltenborn, Russia's attitude toward us has grown not less belligerent but more belligerent.

Are we to conclude, therefore, that a policy like that, a get-tough policy, which has shown a failure to make the Russian people understand our intent, is one that we must keep on pursuing despite that failure. I've seen many instances where a bankrupt wanted you to lend him more money on the basis of his bankruptcy, but this is the first time I've seen that made into a national policy.

Mr. Kaltenborn: Mr. Denny, may I answer that?

Mr. Denny: Go ahead, Mr. Kaltenborn.

Mr. Kaltenborn: In the first place, we have had only one year of what is called "getting tough." We had three years of appeasement. The Russians, because of the messages they get from people like Wallace and his ilk, are not yet sure that we mean it or that the American people will support it. However, they're learning, and I predict that before another year has passed they will respond much more completely than they have responded so far.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Lochner has a comment.

Mr. Lochner: I just have a brief comment and that is that Mr. Ler-

ner assumes that the Russian people are finding out what is happening, for instance, in Germany. Well, he hasn't lived in that dictatorial, authoritative, totalitarian country else he would know that the people don't get to know anything.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Laski?

Mr. Laski: I spoke to 2,000 young people in Tashkent in the Republic of Uzbekistan in the autumn of 1946 on Franklin D. Roosevelt, and at the end a young girl got up and asked, when I went back to the United States, would I tell Americans that they were grateful for all that Mr. Roosevelt had done for them during the war and that he was as much a part of Russian history as he was of American history. Make no mistake about that. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Lochner?

Mr. Lochner: That's because F. D.R. is a saint in Russia and has been billed as such but you can't get the ordinary facts of American life over to them.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now the photographer better get a picture of this pretty little blonde down here asking a question. All right. Go ahead.

Lady: My question is for Mr. Lochner. If many European countries become communist, what right has the United States to interfere, if that is the way the people want to vote?

Mr. Lochner: You're assuming

that there have been any free elections, in Czechoslovakia, let us take, just for an example. I'm surprised that you ask the question whether there are free elections. There just aren't. There aren't in Eastern Germany. It can be demonstrated that every election there is a rigged one. When you take the City of Berlin, where all the four powers controlled the elections, the Communists got 19.3 per cent of the votes; out in the provinces, 85 per cent of the vote.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Lochner. We're going to have to leave that question with the public. While we get ready for tonight's summaries by our speakers, here's a special message of interest to you.

Announcer: As we move about the country with Town Meeting and people begin to think about their own responsibilities for these subjects we discuss, they almost invariably ask the question, "What can I do?"

To help you answer this question for yourself, Mr. Denny has prepared a simple, brief twelve-point program containing suggestions which you will find useful. For example, in Point Twelve he says, "Serve with Integrity."

"The Greeks knew that no system, however well designed, could save a city or a nation if its people were corrupt. 'The strength of a city is in the virtue of its citizens,' is the way they put it. There is no substitute for integrity in

thought and in action. Today, more than ever, we need a ruthless honesty that is impervious to the demands of self-interested pressure groups, out-worn social customs, class cleavages, racism and constricting nationalisms."

If you would like a copy of this twelve-point program, answering the question, *What Can I Do?*, send 10 cents to Town Hall, New York 18, New York. Be sure to give your own name and address clearly. Our address is Town Hall, New York 18, New York.

Now for the summaries of tonight's discussion, here is Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: Here first is Max Lerner.

Mr. Lerner: What we need most now is not just arms, but a real meeting of the minds—meeting of the minds with the people of Europe, but also with the rulers of Russia; meeting of the minds, not just for the purpose of horse swapping, but for the purpose of deciding what kind of general framework of world authority will be established. The Russians, in effect, are saying to the people of Europe, "Be my brother or I'll knock your head off." Let us not say to them, "Be my brother or I'll starve you."

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now, a final word from Mr. Lochner.

Mr. Lochner: The attitude of Mr. Laski and Mr. Lerner tonight reminds me of a word in the *Ecclesiastes IX*. It begins, "Wis-

dom is better than weapons of war." That would seem to give the edge to my two honorable opponents.

However, the Bible, the wisest of books, continues, "But one sinner destroyeth much good." That's where Mr. Kaltenborn and I come in. We realize that such a sinner is at large and is destroying an awful lot of good. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Lochner, and now a final word from Mr. Laski.

Mr. Laski: Mr. Chairman, let America be strong, but if America is to be generous, let it begin by being just. Let it be intelligent and not hysterical. Let it give to the service of peace the same devotion that it has given to the service of war. Thereby it fulfills the purpose of American history. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Laski. Now, thirty seconds for Mr. Kaltenborn.

Mr. Kaltenborn: Louis Lochner and I have presented a realistic, constructive program for peace and recovery in Europe. We urge co-operation abroad, preparedness at home. Both Harold Laski and Max Lerner agree with us that our European Recovery Program is constructive. They agree we need preparedness. Mr. Lochner and I point to Russian aggression and the unscrupulous methods which Communists employ.

Misguided liberals continue to preach appeasement. When deal-

ing with dictators, appeasement leads to war. Realists preach preparedness. Let us deal fairly, but let us lead from strength. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, H. V. Kaltenborn, Harold Laski, Louis Lochner, and Max Lerner. Let us express appreciation to our hosts, the University of South Carolina, the Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Merchants Association, and radio station WCOS.

Now, friends, if you want a copy of this discussion, remember, you may obtain it by sending 10 cents to Town Hall, New York 18, New York.

Ever since we extended invitations to the candidates for the Republican presidential nomination a few months ago, many of you have been writing in to ask us to invite Henry Wallace to speak. Let me say here and now that we've tried diligently to bring Mr. Wallace to this microphone ever since he broke with President

Truman more than a year ago.

We'll be glad to have Mr. Wallace on this program at any time a mutually satisfactory date can be arranged and a mutually satisfactory opponent.

In the meantime, we bring you a very lively discussion next week from Charlotte, North Carolina on the subject, "Will the Third Party Bring Us Peace and Prosperity?" Our speakers will be Senator Glen H. Taylor of Idaho, vice-presidential candidate on the Henry Wallace New Party ticket; Dorothy Thompson, columnist; James Stewart Martin, attorney and chairman of the Progressive Party of Maryland, supporting Henry Wallace for President; and Dwight MacDonald, editor and publisher of the magazine *Politics* and author of the new book *Henry Wallace—the Man and the Myth*.

So make your plans now to be with us next Tuesday and every Tuesday at the sound of the Crier bell. (*Applause.*)